

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 24, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 26, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-2, 4-24 and 26-44 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 3, 25 and 45-47 have been canceled. Claims 1-2, 19, 21-24, 36 and 45-47 are rejected. Claims 3-18, 20, 25-35 and 37-44 are objected to. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 19, 21, 22, 23-24 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Levy (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0112974).

Regarding claims 1 and 23:

Applicants have amended Claim 1 to incorporate dependent claim 3, and Applicants have amended claim 23 to incorporate dependent claim 25. The Examiner has indicated that claims 3 and 25 recite allowable subject matter, but objected to these claims as being dependent on a rejected base claim. By incorporating the allowable subject matter recited by claims 3 and 25 into independent claims 1 and 23, respectively, Applicants believe that claims 1 and 23 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 and 23.

Regarding claims 2, 19, 21, 22, 23-24 and 36:

Claims 2, 19, 21, 22, 23-24 and 36 each depend from one of claims 1 and 23. As Applicants believe that, as amended, claims 1 and 23 are in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that these dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 45-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levy (US 2003/0112974) in view of Kanevsky et al. (US 2002/0107750).

Claims 45-47 are canceled with this response, without prejudice to further prosecution of these claims. Accordingly, Applicants believe a detailed discussion of this rejection is unnecessary.

Objected Claims

Claims 4-18, 20, 26-35 and 37-44 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claims 4-18, 20, 26-35 and 37-44 each depend from one of claims 1 and 23. As Applicants believe that, as amended, independent claims 1 and 23 are in condition for allowance, Applicants believe that these dependent claims are also in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

If the Examiner believes any issues remain that prevent this application from going to issue, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to contact Jon K. Stewart, Attorney for Applicants at (713) 623-4844, to discuss strategies for moving prosecution forward toward allowance.

Having addressed all issues set out in the Final Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Jon K. Stewart
Registration No. 54,945
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant